

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 17-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,385,552 (“Snyder”). Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Snyder in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0044693 (“Hadley”). Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections.

Interview Summary

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Khanh Pham participated in a telephonic interview on January 9, 2007 to discuss the present claim amendments. Examiner Pham indicated that the above claim amendments appeared to overcome the rejections of record.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action states that the claim term "device startup project" is not evident in the specification. Applicants note that the term "device startup project" was merely a typographical error which has been corrected to recite the intended term "device setup project," which is described at least in paragraph 0046 of the specification. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 17-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Snyder. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 17 and 22 recite that, after being deployed to a device, a database is installed on the device for testing of *the device on which the device database is being installed*. The device database is installed according to a selected installation property. The selected installation property is one of an always overwrite property, an overwrite if different property, and a never overwrite property.

Snyder is directed to collecting test measurements. Snyder discloses that a testing program (“Test Executive”) may be downloaded to a testing component *for testing other modules* (Snyder, Col. 30, ll. 30-57). Thus, Snyder does not teach or suggest deploying a device database to a device for testing of *the device on which the device database is being installed*, as recited in independent claims 17 and 22.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 17 and 22 are not anticipated by Snyder. Applicants further submit that claims 18-21 and 23-26 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Snyder in view of Hadley. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1 and 9 recite that, after being deployed to a device (as part of a device project), a database is installed on the device for testing of *the device on which the device database is being installed*. The device database is installed according to a selected installation property. The selected installation property specifies whether or not an existing version of the device database on the device should be overwritten by the deployed version of the device database.

As described above, Snyder is directed to collecting test measurements. Snyder discloses that a testing program (“Test Executive”) may be downloaded to a testing component *for testing other modules* (Snyder, Col. 30, ll. 30-57). Thus, Snyder does not teach or suggest deploying a device database to a device for testing of *the device on which the device database is being installed*, as recited in independent claims 1 and 9. Hadley similarly fails to teach or suggest this feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 17 and 22 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that claims 2-8 and 10-16 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 303661.01 / MSFT-2791
Application No.: 10/719,481
Office Action Dated: November 14, 2006

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that no new matter has been added by the present amendment. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: February 13, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439